

REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Final Office Action dated March 10, 2008, 2007 and received in this application. Reconsideration of the pending claims in light of these amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/01161616 A1 to Um et al. ("Um") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,659,742 to Beattie et al. ("Beattie"). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 recites: *[a] file managing apparatus for managing files recorded on a recording medium which has an index file recorded as a series of entries including blocks of extract information derived from and corresponding to said files to be managed;*

wherein said index file includes a plurality of files into which data including the extract information is divided by attribute and the plurality of files includes a property file having data representative of attributes of said files to be managed;

wherein said file managing apparatus records a still picture file in such a manner that an entry including extract information about the still picture file is registered into said index file, and reorganizes said index file in such a manner that a plurality of still picture files recorded on said recording medium are grouped into a single movie file; and

wherein the entries corresponding to said plurality of still picture files grouped into said movie file are deleted from said index file by setting a valid-invalid information as invalid in the property file to indicate that the corresponding extract information is invalid, while an entry including extract information about said movie file is registered into said index file.

These claimed features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Um. Um discloses a technique for organizing an index file by allowing the index files to be variously assigned to groups according to a filename list so that the particular groups can be easily managed separately from the other groups. The Um system allows the user to easily add or remove a still picture from a given group, without removing the still picture from the other groups that it resides in. This ostensibly

allows improved management of the user's still pictures. This is clearly evident in FIG. 8 of Um, wherein it is shown that the picture "BABY1095" may be added to filename list #2. Once this picture is in this filename list #2, that and the other pictures may be variously sequenced. There is no deletion of the index file for the picture, as the UM technique is merely organizing pictures into a file list.

In Um, there is no deletion of the index file nor is there any impetus to do so, since Um has nothing whatsoever to do with consolidating numerous index file entries into a movie file. Rather, as noted Um is an organizational tool that allows the still image files to be assigned to any number of groups.

Still further, there is clearly no disclosure or suggestion of the *"plurality of still picture files recorded on said recording medium are grouped into a single movie file..."* as claimed by Applicant. As mentioned, the still picture index is retained in UM. There is no mention of removing multiple still picture indices in favor of a single movie file as claimed. The Action vaguely references claim 2 and the Abstract, but these merely restate what is described above, which is that Um merely organizes pictures with the filename list.

The Action also states "[t]he STREAM being the movie file". This only further illustrates the impropriety of the rejection. STREAM merely refers to a directory in the DVR directory. This includes stream files (*.m2ts) containing actual motion-picture data stream packets. There is absolutely no mention of any kind of grouping still picture indices into a single movie file in Um. Additionally, even if one presumes that STREAM is a movie file, there is never any mention in Um of grouping still picture indices into a single STREAM file.

Finally, as the Action states, Um does not disclose (or suggest) deleting the index file. Nor does it disclose the particular fashion in which deletion is carried out, specifically, *"wherein the entries corresponding to said plurality of still picture files grouped into said movie file are deleted from said index file by setting a valid-invalid information as invalid in the property file to indicate that the corresponding extract information is invalid, while an entry including extract information about said movie file is registered into said index file,"* as claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, Um is deficient in its failure to disclose the claimed invention in various ways, well beyond the characterization of Um in the Action.

Beattie does not remedy the deficiencies of Um. Beattie discloses a method for storing multimedia information in an information retrieval system. Beattie discloses a database that stores image and text information that can both be retrieved in response to a single query. The passage cited in the Action (31:26-39) merely speaks to the management of an index table, and how the table is updated when image and text information is deleted from the database.

Beattie is clearly even further removed from Applicant's claimed invention than Um, and fails to cure the deficiencies noted above. Since various features are absent from even the combination of Um and Beattie, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been presented for independent claim 1.

For reasons similar to those provided regarding claim 1, the remaining independent claims are also neither disclosed nor suggested by the relied-upon references, alone or in combination. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and thus incorporate the distinct features recited therein, as well as their own, separately recited patentably distinct features.

This response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action. However, Applicant reserves the right to set forth further arguments supporting the patentability of the claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers. Further, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicant expressly does not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.

Application No. 10/574,945
Amendment dated May 9, 2008
Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2008

Docket No.: SON-3117

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SON-3117 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: May 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By



Christopher M. Tobin

Registration No.: 40,290

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorneys for Applicant